

ACTIVE CASES
Analysis of December 2005 QA Results for Food Stamps

Sample Size 83
(drops excluded)

Totals for December 2005:

LOCATION	TOTAL SAMPLE ISSUANCE	# of ERROR CASES	ERROR DOLLAR TOTAL	PERCENT DOLLARS IN ERROR	FFY 2006 ERROR RATE
STATEWIDE	\$16,410.00	10	\$ 563.00	3.4%	3.7%
MILWAUKEE	7,058.00	7	360.00	5.1%	4.8%
BAL- STATE	\$9.352.00	3	\$ 203.00	2.2 %	2.9%

ERROR CAUSES BY TYPE:

10- Agency Preventable Errors (APE)
2- Client Errors
0- State/CARES Errors

OVERVIEW OF THE ERRORS AND WHERE THEY OCCURRED:

Of the 10 Agency Preventable Errors, 5 were in Milwaukee, and one each in Clark, Eau Claire, Ozaukee, Rock and Washburn Counties. The 2 client errors were in Milwaukee.

TYPES OF A.P.E. ERRORS (10):

Shelter & Utilities (3):

- Agency failed to verify and budget correct utilities (3). In one case a disability was not entered correctly in CARES so the shelter cap was not lifted on the shelter/utility deduction. In another case the agency failed to budget a utility expense (the utility had been paid directly by a relative but QC verified the payments were loans, expected to be repaid).

Earned Income (3)

- Agency failed to budget a recurring shift differential payment
- Agency failed to use recent pay information in new estimate at application
- Agency failed to verify and recalculate income at review

Self Employment (1):

- Agency failed to budget self-employment which the customer reported

Other Expenses (2):

- Agency failed to allow reported Child Support expense which showed on pay stubs.
- Agency used a child care expense from 2004. Failed to question and correct budget at subsequent reviews. Customer has had no expense.

Out of Certification (1):

- Agency opened a case that had closed at end of 5-month TFS period. A new request and signed application is required. QC had to use actual circumstances.
-

TYPES OF CLIENT ERRORS (2):

- Client failed to report correct rent at review
- Client failed to report correct household composition* and correct rent at application*her child had left the household prior to application)

WHEN WERE THE AGENCY PREVENTABLE ERRORS MADE? Two APEs were made at application, six were made at review, one at reported change.

EFFECT OF SMRF PROCESS: No errors found because of SMRF process for this month

TRENDS OR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Fortunately although there were a lot of errors most of them were for relatively small amounts—with a couple exceptions.

BIGGEST “CONTRIBUTORS”: The cases that caused the largest dollar errors for December, 2005 (including client errors):

Milwaukee County, \$110 Agency Preventable Error:

The client reported self-employment and the agency created self-employment screens but end-dated the sequences at the same time so no income was budgeted.

Rock County, \$98 Agency Preventable Error:

Money paid by a third party for utilities was a loan. The agency didn't investigate it, and thus the customer should have received the HSUA deduction and didn't.

mbw 04/24/2006